

Message

From: Marshall, Tom [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5D29134E5E32489B9AB0AEB262F55075-TMARSHAL]
Sent: 5/9/2017 7:15:55 PM
To: Tomiak, Robert [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=e43d67fe354a4d06be80afa6eb65e614-Tomiak, Rob]; Starfield, Lawrence [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=8a89d6cd217d4254a5879abecb3f314e-Starfield, Lawrence]; Cozad, David [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=4a30a28be6a74d3da779bb7f7b34a876-COZAD, DAVID]
CC: Knight, Kelly [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=47fc4b0c90f94826a1d9a48381f4009f-Knight, Kel]
Subject: RE: Rosemont letter

Just seeing all this and wanted to throw out that the Region's approach does seem to be fairly general/cryptic and 404-based on its face. If assertive. So I'm not sure how much of a CEQ referral issue this letter raises, per se, or even implicitly. And I wonder whether OW should be involved in any HQ elevation mix here, if they're not already. Sorry so slow on the draw. Thanks.

202.564.5549

From: Tomiak, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2017 12:03 PM
To: Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>; Cozad, David <Cozad.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Knight, Kelly <knight.kelly@epa.gov>; Marshall, Tom <marshall.tom@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Rosemont letter

R9 response below on intent to elevate to the political team. I think our team's assessment of R9's proposed letter is that it does trigger the elevation criteria (cited immediately below in my note back to Kathleen).

V/R, Rob

From: Tomiak, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Johnson, Kathleen <Johnson.Kathleen@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Rosemont letter

OK, good to know. I think we had considered the following as potentially being triggered:

- A letter on a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) that characterizes a residual serious concern (and/or proposes or implies that a supplemental analysis might be required)

Larry intends to try to connect with Alexis sometime today to discuss/strategize.

Thanks, Rob

From: Johnson, Kathleen
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2017 11:43 AM
To: Tomiak, Robert <tomiak.robert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Rosemont letter

We don't think this needs elevation.

Kathleen H. Johnson
Director, Enforcement Division
U.S. EPA - Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street ENF-1
San Francisco, CA 94015
415/972-3873
johnson.kathleen@epa.gov

From: Tomiak, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 2:11 AM
To: Johnson, Kathleen <johnson.kathleen@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Rosemont letter

Thank you; how/when do you envision briefing the political team, and do you want us to help set that up (after advance coord between Larry and Alexis). Or are you still thinking Alexis could send this without elevation?

Rob

On May 8, 2017, at 7:43 PM, Johnson, Kathleen <johnson.kathleen@epa.gov> wrote:

We have discussed where we are on the Rosemont project here in the region. We propose that Alexis send the attached letter to Cal Joyner at the Forest Service. In essence, the letter restates that we continue to have significant concerns with this project. However, since the proponent must get an Army Corp permit, we are stating that we will await the Corp's decision before determining our course of action. We think this is an appropriate course of action at this time. Please call if you have questions or concerns or alternatively, Larry can speak directly with Alexis.

Kathleen H. Johnson
Director, Enforcement Division
U.S. EPA - Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street ENF-1
San Francisco, CA 94015
415/972-3873
johnson.kathleen@epa.gov

<Rosemont Strauss to Joyner 050817-AS.DOCX>